Applicant : Bhatt et al.
Serial No. : 10/698,089
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 7 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-119001 / 2003P00394
US

REMARKS

The final office action that was mailed July 10, 2008, rejected claims 1-26, all of which are pending. Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 4-6, 10-11, 13-15, and 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,062,502 to Kesler ("Kesler"). Of these, claims 1 and 10 are independent. Claims 2, 4-6, 19-21, and 25 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1; claims 11, 13-15, 22-24, and 26 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 10.

Claim 1 recites a method of generating an electronic report from a list view. The method includes "providing, in a first application, a list view of data objects, the list view displaying an object field and an attribute for at least one of the data objects." The method also includes "receiving a user selection of at least one object field," and "generating an output file that an external reporting application can use to generate a tabulated report, the tabulated report to include the attributes corresponding to the selected at least one object field." The method further includes "launching, after generating the output file, the external reporting application and generating the tabulated report using the launched external reporting application, the tabulated report comprising the attributes corresponding to the selected at least one object field."

Kesler relates to generating a user interface for a relational database. *See* Abstract. The user interface (UI) architecture is tightly coupled with the structure of metadata relating to entities, entity fields, entity relationships, and entity search paths. *See* col. 13, lines 4-6. Data may be displayed in the UI, and the data display is list-driven. *See* col. 13, line 24. All data lists are based on database views. *See* col. 13, lines 24-25. Menus can be generated from data lists by right-mouse clicking on the list or using the CTRL-M key combination on a keyboard. *See* col. 13, lines 48-50. An "Export" menu option can be selected to export an entire data list to one of several file formats using an export wizard. *See* Col. 29, lines 51-52. Information may be extracted for a predefined report using a report writer such as Crystal Reports or BusinessObjects®. *See* col. 13, lines 58-61.

Applicant : Bhatt et al.
Serial No. : 10/698,089
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 8 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-119001 / 2003P00394
US

Kesler does not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter set forth in Applicants' claim 1, and discloses a technique that is very different, for several reasons, from the method recited in Applicants' claim 1.

For example, Kesler fails to disclose or suggest "launching, after generating the output file, the external reporting application." Indeed, Kesler does not disclose launching an external reporting application at all. In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cited Kesler's disclosure of Component Object Model (COM) communication between a user interface and external components as disclosing this feature of Applicants' claim 1. *See* office action, page 4. This is not correct. Nowhere does Kesler disclose launching an external application, whether involving COM communication or otherwise. Kesler discloses that COM can be used to allow Component A to communicate with Component B, but does not disclose that an external reporting application can be launched after generating an output file. Indeed, Kesler teaches away from launching an external reporting application because Kesler discloses that COM is used to permit communication between components, implying that each of the components are presently running when such communication begins. Moreover, as described above, Applicants' claim 1 recites launching the external reporting application "after generating the output file," and again, Kesler does not disclose or suggest this feature.

Also, Kesler does not disclose or suggest "receiving a user selection of at least one object field," and "generating an output file that an external reporting application can use to generate a tabulated report . . . [that] include[s] the attributes corresponding to the selected at least one object field," as recited in claim 1. Kesler discloses passing a primary key value of a selected record to a report writer using COM (*see* column 29, lines 54-57), where a primary key value uniquely identifies a single row (*see* Table 1, definition of "Primary Key"). This is very different from the method disclosed by Applicants' claim 1, where user selection of at least one object field is received. One non-limiting example of how this aspect of Applicants' claim 1 may be implemented is shown in Applicants' specification at FIGS. 3-4 and described at page 11, lines 7-12 and page 12, lines 15-32. As shown and described, a user may select one or more grid columns that correspond to object fields of the list view (that is, the columns shown in FIG. 3 in this example), such that an output file may be generated, where the output file can be used by an external reporting application to generate a tabulated report to include the attributes corresponding to the received at least one object field. The process disclosed by Kesler is actually similar in several respects to the

Applicant : Bhatt et al.
Serial No. : 10/698,089
Filed   : October 31, 2003
Page   : 9 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-119001 / 2003P00394
US

Microsoft® Outlook® example that Applicants describe in the background section of the present application, where a particular data object is selected (*see* Applicants' background section at page 2, lines12-24), rather than one or more object fields, as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Neither does Kesler render these aspects of Applicants' claim 1 obvious. For example, there are advantages to the method of Applicants' claim 1 that are not contemplated by Kesler. A user of the method described in Applicants' claim 1 need not be concerned with separately launching a particular external reporting tool or multiple reporting tools, and may instead focus on identifying desired report content from the list view of data objects. This may facilitate ease of use, as the separate step of launching an external reporting application may be avoided.

For at least these reasons, claim 1, and dependent claims 2, 4-6, 19-21, and 25 are patentable over Kesler, and Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejections of these claims.

Separately, dependent claim 25 is additionally patentable over Kesler because Kesler fails to disclose or suggest a method wherein the list view of data objects displays a plurality of object fields and attributes for at least one of the data objects, and the received user selection of at least one object field represents a subset of the plurality of object fields. In this fashion, only those object fields of interest for a particular report may be selected such that data objects may be displayed in the report with attributes corresponding to the selected object fields, and not with attributes corresponding to non-selected object fields. Kesler, by contrast, discloses that "the entire data list" is exported. *See* Col. 29, lines 51-52. A user of the Kesler system desiring to create a report with a subset of the available object fields would have to create a report as disclosed in Kesler (the report including the entire data list), and then manually delete (e.g., using the external reporting application) columns from the generated report that correspond to non-desired object fields. For at least these reasons, claim 25 is separately patentable over Kesler.

Claim 10 recites a computer-readable medium with program instructions stored thereon, that when executed perform the method of claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 10, as well as dependent claims 11, 13-15, 22-24, and 26 is also not anticipated by Kesler. Separately, claim 26 is additionally patentable over Kesler for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 25. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejections of these claims.

Applicant : Bhatt et al.
Serial No. : 10/698,089
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 10 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-119001 / 2003P00394
US

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 7-9, 12, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Kesler in view of various other references. Claims 3 and 7-9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and claims 12 and 16-18 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 10.

As described above, claims 1 and 10 each define subject matter that is patentable over Kesler. The other relied-upon references do not cure the deficiencies of Kesler with respect to either claim 1 or claim 10. As such, claims 1 and 10 each define subject matter that is patentable over the references of record, whether alone or in combination, as do dependent claims 3, 7-9, 12, and 16-18. Accordingly, Applicants ask the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 3, 7-9, 12, and 16-18.

Applicant : Bhatt et al.   Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-119001 / 2003P00394
Serial No. : 10/698,089   US
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 11 of 11

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that each of claims 1-26 is in condition for allowance and ask the Examiner to issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fees are believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: *Sept. 10, 2008*

Kurt F. Krenz
Reg. No. 62,664

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

60515762.doc